

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 28, 2002 LR 4

that would make sense. Now, if there's another one, I want to be free to think about that. I wouldn't put it here. I, of course, would consider making as clear a definition as I could in the enabling statute that this Legislature would use in carrying out this act.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Let me ask you also, would you consider...would you seriously consider in an enabling statute something that required perhaps a supermajority of the local body approving these for the reason that you would want to avoid controversy with the respect to the approval of nonprofits who may themselves be controversial in the community? How...or how else...

SENATOR LANDIS: I would consider that.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...without...a supermajority or how else could you approach that potential problem?

SENATOR LANDIS: The...this Legislature would have the authority to draw that measure. I...my guess is that there might be some reason to consider that cart-horse kind of a problem, but the answer is we can draw any kind of standards that we want here, as narrow as we want it, and if we wanted to add some procedural protections we would be free to do so because it would only be through us that the cities and counties would be able to exercise this authority and we could put as many or as few strings as we wanted on it. I think you'd have to look around to the body to say whether or not you have some faith in whether we would be able to exercise this authority well.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Yeah. Okay. Enough for today. Thank you, Senator.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Further debate? Seeing none, Senator Schimek, you're recognized to close on the committee amendments.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members. I would just remind the body that the only thing that the committee amendment does that's different from the original bill is that it provides for property used primarily for sectarian